DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 453 117 SO 032 759

AUTHOR Boufoy-Bastick, Beatrice
TITLE Allocating Educational Funding To Maximize Academic Attainments.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 11p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Cross Campus Conference of the University of the West Indies (5th, St. Augustine, Trinidad, and Tobago, West Indies, April 7-9, 1999).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Education; Cultural Context; *Educational Attainment; Educational Research; *Educational Resources; Ethnography; Foreign Countries; *Resource Allocation; *Secondary Education
IDENTIFIERS *Educational Issues; *Fiji

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the controversial issue of educational resource allocation for the purpose of improving educational standards in secondary schools. The current dilemma is whether educational resources should be directed to increasing school-based resources or directed to supporting teacher training. The paper controversially argues that both positions are non-optimal. It briefly presents the methodological framework of a 4-year ethnographic study conducted in Fiji in the South Pacific. Based on data from the study, it argues that educational outcomes are fundamentally influenced by social and cultural factors. In particular, the closer a community's educational values are to their sociocultural values, the higher that community's educational attainments will be. Hence, higher educational standards are more likely to be achieved by matching the learning culture with the social culture--the tighter the fit, the higher the resulting educational standards will be. Thus, the focus of the controversy should not lie in prioritizing educational resource allocation to either school-based resources or teacher training, but rather in determining the best use for those resources. The ensuing controversy, then, is whether to change the social culture to match the demands of formal education or to change the demands of formal education to match the social culture. Contains a table and 46 references. (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 453 117

Allocating Educational Funding to Maximise Academic Attainments.

Boufoy-Bastick, Beatrice

SO 032 759

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Beatrice Boufoy-Bastick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper presented at the Fifth Biennial cross-campus conference on '***Controversies in Education***', Trinidad and Tobago, April 7-9th, 1999.

ALLOCATING EDUCATIONAL FUNDING TO MAXIMISE ACADEMIC ATTAINMENTS

Béatrice Boufoy-Bastick

Abstract

This paper discusses the controversial issue of educational resource allocation for the purpose of improving educational standards in secondary schools. The current dilemma is whether educational resources should be directed to increasing school-based resources or directed to supporting teacher training. This paper controversially argues that both positions are non-optimal. Based on the data from a four-year ethnographic study, it argues that educational outcomes are fundamentally influenced by social and cultural factors. In particular, the closer a community's educational values are to their sociocultural values then the higher will be their educational attainments. Hence, higher educational standards are more likely to be achieved by matching the learning culture with the social culture - the tighter the fit the higher will be the resulting educational standards. The controversy thus should not lie so much in prioritising educational resource allocation to either school-based resources or teacher training, but on whether to use those resources to change either the social culture or the school culture to tighten the fit. The ensuing controversy then, is whether to change the social culture to match the demands of formal education or to change the demands of formal education to match the social culture.

Summary

This paper discusses how best to use a country's educational resources to improve educational standards. The common dilemma is to what extent educational funding input is a predictor of higher educational attainment (Kazal-Thresher, 1993; Mathews & Johnson, 1995; McCracken & Peasley, 1995) and whether funding should prioritise school-based resource allocation or teacher training awards (McCracken & Peasley, 1995). Neither of these positions yields the expected improvements in educational standards and educational decision-making must move away from input-directed policies (Hanushek, 1989) to culturally-responsive ones. This is supported by a major research finding which has emerged from an four-year long ethnographic study in a ACP (Africa, Caribbean, Pacific) island country and which has particular relevance to multicultural Caribbean societies. Based on this major finding the paper argues that educational attainments are culturally-rooted and are overt societal manifestations of the cultural importance placed upon formal education. *Educational standards reflect the degree to which a community values education,* that is, the degree to which the community's culture fits with the education culture, the tighter the fit the higher the educational standards. Hence, funding to increase educational attainment would be better allocated to increasing the fit between a community's educational values and their social values.

This article briefly presents the methodological framework of the study, reviews major educational funding policies and, in the light of the major findings from the study, it suggests alternative funding policies geared to maximising educational success.

The study researched contrasts in how two culturally-distinct ethnic groups translated a Ministry

of Education common curriculum into their particular teaching practices and how these different practices resulted in markedly different educational attainments. The study followed an anthropological methodological model from the perspective of 'Grounded Theory' (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser & Strauss, 1971; Glaser, 1978; Glaser, 1994; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). The ethnographic data on which this paper is based were collected in extremely culturally different rural secondary schools and communities in Fiji. Research instruments included classroom observation and recorded semi-structured interviews with school personnel and community representatives and samples of work from Forms III (grade 9) and IV (grade 10) students of English. Data analysis was conducted both etically, from an international perspective, and emically from an insider's point of view (Geertz, 1973; Lévi-Strauss, 1958; Strauss, 1987) - emic interpretation was essential for elucidation and triangulation of the thickly contextualised ethnographic data.

Successive government funding policies had been implemented in Fiji to narrow ethnic educational attainment differences e.g. affirmative action policy, university scholarships, special grants etc. and none had yielded the expected outcomes. These funding policies aimed at differentially increasing either curriculum resources or at differentially supporting teacher training merely addressed symptomatic manifestations of a more deeply culturally-rooted cause. The two ethnic groups' continued to maintain their disturbing differential attainments in external secondary school examinations. An analysis of the data on the two groups' community cultures has highlighted major differences in their closeness of fit to the values of the formal education system and found that the closer the fit then the higher are the educational attainments. For example, two aspects that reflecting the two groups' different educational cultures and their differential academic attainments were their different educational managerial styles and the different role they expected from their teachers.

In the light of these findings, it is clear that future educational funding policy needs to acknowledge the fundamental culture-related aspects of differential educational attainments and to be directed to minimise the cultural gap between education and community. Two possible approaches are suggested: curriculum adaptation and value-switching.

ALLOCATING EDUCATIONAL FUNDING TO MAXIMISE ACADEMIC ATTAINMENTS

Introduction

This paper discusses how best to use a country's educational resources to improve educational standards. The common dilemma is to what extent educational funding input is a predictor of higher educational attainment (Bailey & Tomlinson, 1996; Kazal-Thresher, 1993; Mathews & Johnson, 1995; McCracken & Peasley, 1995) and whether funding should prioritise school-based resource allocation (Crossley & Myra, 1994; UNESCO Report, 1983) or teacher training awards (James-Reid & Mitchell, 1996; McCracken & Peasley, 1995). Neither of these positions yields the expected improvements in educational standards and so educational decision-making must move away from input-directed policies (Hanushek, 1989) to culturally-responsive ones. Research supporting this policy conclusion was conducted in an ACP (Africa, Caribbean, Pacific) island country, Fiji, where there was a marked difference in educational attainments between two cultural groups, a problem which the government addressed by trying many funding policies resulting in little success. This paper briefly presents (1) the methodological framework of the research, (2) reviews the major educational funding policies in Fiji and (3) suggests

alternative culturally-responsive funding policies for maximising educational attainments. The controversial solution to the problem of differential attainments, which this paper suggests, can be used in Fiji and in other similar multicultural societies in the Caribbean.

1 Methodological framework of the study - Research setting and research process

The following brief indication of the methodological framework is provided to show the relevance of (1.1) the research setting and the (1.2) the research process to similar ACP countries, particularly in the Caribbean.

1.1 Research setting

The study was conducted in Fiji in the South Pacific, part of the ACP region. Fiji is a small island state of 300 islands out of which 100 are said to be inhabited (Lotherington, 1998; Mangubhai, 1984; Postlethwaite & Thomas, 1988; Tavola, 1991). Demographically its two major ethnic groups are the indigenous Fijians and the descendants of indentured Indian labourers - two starkly culturally-dissimilar ethnic groups. Their extreme cultural dissimilarity makes Fiji a natural laboratory in which to investigate the question of socio-cultural differential attainments. The great advantage of these natural conditions is that these two extreme contrasts make socio-cultural influences more apparent than they would be in societies with more continuous socio-cultural graduations - as in the Caribbean. The research capitalised on this advantage by carefully separating empirical and theoretical generalisability so that the theoretical findings could be empirically tested contextually and generalised globally to identify similar influences and guide policy recommendations in other socially and culturally heterogeneous societies.

1.2 Research process

The study researched contrasts in how two culturally-distinct ethnic groups translated a Ministry of Education common curriculum into their particular culturally relevant teaching practices and how these different practices resulted in markedly different educational attainments. The study followed an anthropological methodological model from the perspective of 'Grounded Theory' (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Glaser & Strauss, 1971; Glaser, 1978; Glaser, 1994; Strauss, 1987; Strauss & Corbin, 1990; Strauss & Corbin, 1994). The ethnographic data on which this paper is based were collected in some of the most culturally diverse rural secondary schools and communities in Fiji. Research instruments included classroom observation, recorded semi-structured interviews with school personnel and community representatives, samples of work from Forms III (grade 9) and IV (grade 10) students of English and historical colonial documents. Data analysis was conducted both emically for empirical verifications and etically, for theoretical generalisation - emic interpretations were essential for elucidation and triangulation of the thickly contextualised ethnographic data (Geertz, 1973; Lévi-Strauss, 1958; Strauss, 1987). Extensive classroom observation schedules were carried out in which the differential teaching behaviours were noted. Further ethnographic research in schools and communities revealed that markedly different cultural intentions were motivating these differential teaching behaviours.

From the initial stage of the ethnographic research the main concern of respondents was the differential socio-cultural expectations of teaching and its symptomatic differential attainments - the latter having been a major public concern since independence from the British Crown in 1970. The government had addressed this problem, with little success, by implementing a series of funding policies geared to narrowing educational attainments and maximising educational outcomes of indigenous Fijians. The next section briefly overviews Fiji's major educational funding policies, their 'traditional' nature and their lack of success.

2 Review of Fiji's major educational funding policy initiatives

In common with current situations in other countries, the socio-cultural differential attainments in Fiji derive from the world labour movements serving plantation economies of the 1800s. The first part of this short interesting historical backdrop is a common cause. It is presented to show what led to the differential attainments and to indicate the seeds of a solution.

Historical backdrop to Fiji discriminatory educational funding policies

Fiji's demographic profile is represented basically by two culturally diverse ethnic groups: the indigenous Fijians (locally referred to as 'Fijians') and the Indo-Fijians (locally referred to as 'Indians'). The Indians had been brought in as indentured labourers on sugar-cane plantations under the girmit system by the British from 1879 and 1916 (Mangubhai, 1984, p. 169; Mugler, 1996, p. 276; Tavola, 1991, p. 11). Although Indians were to be repatriated after girmit over half of the 60,000 Indians decided to settle in Fiji (Tavola, 1990; Tavola, 1991; Chandra, 1980). A major reason for the decision to settle in Fiji was primarily opportunities for socio-economic advancement which were not open to the lower caste labourers in their home country. A powerful tool for status raising was 'education'. The Indian's determination to avail themselves of this tool was reflected in their higher educational attainments and their overwhelming representation at the higher levels of education. The corresponding Fijian under-representation became a problematic issue which was expected to be solved through discriminatory funding policies (Toren, 1986, p. 315) directed to reduce differential attainments in two major areas: (2.1) by differentially increasing school-based resources and, (2.2) differentially supporting teacher training.

2.1 Educational funding policies to increase school-based resources

The Government tried to redress the imbalance in educational attainments between Fijians and Indians by discriminatively allocating funding to Fijians. Funding schemes were implemented geared to increasing educational resources to Fijians such as allocation of university scholarships, school fee exemption, establishment of Junior Secondary Schools, creation of a Fijian Education Unit and media centres.

The '50/50' university scholarship' scheme had been recommended by the 1969 Education Commission to promote equal numerical ethnic representation at tertiary level. This allowed Fijian students to compete against Fijian students only for 50% of sponsored university places. The remaining 50% were allocated to the other ethnic groups, of which the Indians were the majority and admitted with higher qualification for the same courses as the Fijians. Successive policy evaluations showed limited success as few Fijian students completed their university degree (Baba, 1985, p. 27; Stewart, 1984, p. 4; Tavola, 1991, p. 48; Tierney, 1980, p. 82). The discriminatory school fee exemption policy was then briefly introduced in the 1970's by the Government. It aimed to financially support larger numbers of indigent Fijian students by denying Indian students school fee exemption. The overtly controversial policy had to be abandoned following public outcry (Tavola, 1991, p. 37). A third educational funding policy was geared to facilitating access to secondary education for rural Fijian students. Financial allocations were apportioned to rural communities to establish Junior Secondary Schools as previously recommended by the 1969 Education Commission (1970, pp. 56-57). This policy was to ensure post-primary educational capacity-building in remote rural communities, namely Fijian-populated areas (Hindson, 1981, p. 161; Tavola, 1991, p. 36; Parliamentary Paper No. 9 of 1976, p. 5). A further $3.5 million Special Education grant was allotted to the Ministry of Fijian Affairs

and Rural Development in 1984 to establish new Junior Secondary Schools (JSS) or expand existing ones. The resulting increase in Fijian secondary population however was not matched by a narrowing of educational attainments in external examinations (fig. 2.1). As the extreme 'ruralness' of some Fijian communities was thought to be a reason for Fijian under-performance, the Government decided to direct funding towards developing curriculum resource provisions by setting up rural libraries, or 'media centres', in selected areas. These media centres were strategically located to serve many rural secondary schools (Government of Fiji, 1993, #18.11, p. 128). Here again success remained limited for two main reasons: the distance of students' homes from the students' actual secondary schools resulting in under-utilisation and the Fijian 'kere kere' custom of not returning 'borrowed' books resulted in book disappearance. Another recent example of affirmative action policy was instigated following the publication of the 1993 report 'Opportunities for Growth, Policies and Strategies for Fiji in the Medium Term': the creation of the Fijian Education Unit. This unit sponsors deserving Fijian students for undergraduate and postgraduate courses at the regional university, the University of the South Pacific, and abroad. Fijian Education staff acknowledge the mitigated success of the policy as students fail to pass their first year university examinations and drop out.

2.2 Educational funding policies to support teacher training

The second aspect of educational input-directed policies concerns training of Fijian teachers. Two policies were instigated with a view to improve the quality of teaching in Fijian schools: a pre-service teacher training policy and an in-service teacher training policy.

The pre-service teacher policy was geared to increase the number of qualified Fijian secondary school teachers. A major outcome of this policy was the establishment of the Fiji College of Advanced Education (FCAE) in 1992 under the aegis of the Ministry of Education. The FCAE admission policy specifies that 50% of student places be allotted to indigenous Fijians. A corollary of this policy is the lower entry marks of Fijian applicants compared with those of Indian students. This discrepancy is still apparent in students' final marks on completing the two-year teacher training course, a further indication of differential attainments. Similarly in-service teacher training is sometimes made available to Fijian schools and graduate teachers. On one hand Fijian schools may be earmarked for MOE workshops to instil Indian teaching behaviours in Fijian teachers, such as careful use of classroom teaching and exam-oriented teaching in an effort to play down the emphasis on social aspects of Fijian school life. On the other hand Fijian graduate teachers may obtain scholarships to take up Masters in Australian and New Zealand universities. Returning teachers have little opportunity to put into practice the pedagogical teaching theories advocated abroad given their lack of relevance to the Fijian educational context and their subsequent promotion in educational administration.

The following table (fig. 2.2) indicates the failure of these funding alternatives by illustrating the continuing differential educational outcomes as measured by the external secondary school examinations at the Form IV Fiji Junior Certificate (in grade 10) and at the Form VI Fiji School Leaving Certificate (in grade 12).

Source of information: Fiji Ministry of Education 1995

FIJI JUNIOR ENTRANCE EXAMINATION
RESULTS 1994
FIJIANS

A Grade	-	502	=	8.12%

B Grade	-	1832	=	29.62%
C Grade	-	2715	=	43.90%
	INDIANS			
A Grade	-	1454	=	22.86%
B Grade	-	20043	=	32.13%
C Grade	-	1880	=	29.56%

NATIONAL %

	FIJIAN			
A Grade	-	502	=	4.0%
B Grade	-	1832	=	14.6%
C Grade	-	2715	=	21.6%
	INDIAN			
A Grade	-	1454	=	11.5%
B Grade		2043	=	16.2%
C Grade	-	1880	=	14.9%

This review evidenced the failure of input-directed educational policies to increase educational outcomes which were implemented by the Fiji Ministry of Education (Baba, 1979; 1985; Nabobo, 1994; Nabuka, 1982; 1984; Stewart, 1984).

3 Alternative culturally-responsive funding policies for maximising educational attainments

Successive government funding policies had been implemented in Fiji to narrow ethnic educational attainment differences e.g. affirmative action policy, university scholarships, special grants etc. and none had yielded the expected outcomes. These funding policies were either aimed at differentially increasing either curriculum resources or at differentially supporting teacher training and merely addressed symptomatic manifestations of a more deeply culturally-rooted cause. This was captured vividly by a Muslim principal who discerningly ascribed the cause of differential academic attainments to differential cultural attitudes to education.

Interview extract for Labasa Muslim principal

+++ ON-LINE DOCUMENT: TB7A
+++ Retrieval: 1 document out of 624, = 0.2%
+++ For this document: 2 units out of 80, = 2.5%
+++ Text units 31-32:
The senior education officer came. I said "Look, you look at my school, Form 3 we have 30% Fijians, Form 4 30%, Form 5 20%, Form 6 ten, Form 7 four. I said why this is it like an underdeveloped country with a basis very wide and the top very narrow. Why, have you asked any of your village people? You are simply sitting on the table not realising anything.... We talk about 2 million dollars for Fijian education. What Fijian education are we talking about? I try to understand. You are just trying to give them money nothing else. Money does not... You are giving them the books, one day they take the books, next day they bring half the books. Half the books is gone.... **Change their attitude first**... 32

The study indicates that educational attainments are culturally-rooted and are overt societal manifestations of the cultural importance placed upon formal education. Educational standards reflect the degree to which a community values education; that is, the degree to which the community's culture fits with the education culture, the tighter the fit the higher the educational standards. This is evident in Fiji where academic success is contingent upon valuing competition, determination to excel, stringent study habits, that is to say foregoing immediate gratification for later academic rewards. These values are differentially shared by Indians and Fijians (Tierney, 1971; 1980). Indians value hard work and self-denying and competitively strive to achieve the highest results. Fijians in contrast honour their 'vanua' (Ravuvu, 1987; 1995), value social relationships and communal living and their intrinsic values of sharing and collaboration. Solitary activities, such as studying, are culturally unbecoming as the individual exists in terms of his/her mataqali or clan and has little recognition as an individual. Competing against one another, a condition for educational success, is correspondingly inimical to Fijian culture. Fiji's learning culture suggests values of commitment to private study, determination to acquire knowledge and rests upon a spirit of competition - values which are inherent to Indian culture. The close fit between the Indian and the learning culture is evident in Indian students' higher educational attainments. Correspondingly the Fijian and learning culture share few common values and their distinctiveness results in Fijian students' lower educational attainments. The solution which is here suggested is to use funding resources to match the learning culture with the social culture by either changing the school curriculum to match the social culture or else by changing the social culture to match the curriculum. The choice to be made rests in the hands of educational and political policy-makers.

Conclusion

This paper argues that educational input-direct policies fail to achieve the expected outcomes by merely focusing resources on treating educational symptoms. It is then suggested that policy-makers look at the degree to which the community's culture fits with the education culture given the premise that the tighter the fit the higher the educational standards to be achieved. Educational standards are a mere reflection of the degree to which a community values education, hence funding interventions would bring higher educational returns by increasing the fit between a community's educational values and their social values.

References

Baba, P. (1997d, February 15). Poverty is a major factor. **The Fiji Times, Weekend Issue,** p. 3.

Baba, T.L. (1979). **Some Researchable Problems in Fijian Education.** Paper presented to Research Seminar in Fijian Education. The University of the South Pacific, November 1979.

Baba, T.L. (1985). Fijian education in the context of the modern, multi-cultural society. **Journal of the Fiji Teachers Union**, May 1985, 27-31.

Bailey, B. & Tomlinson, E. (1996). Financing democratization of education in the Caribbean. Interplay of private and public sources. **Caribbean Journal of Education 18**(2), 204-217.

Basow, S. (1984). Ethnic Group Differences in Educational Achievement in Fiji. **Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15**(4), 435-51.

Chandra, R. (1980). **Maro. Rural Indians of Fiji.** Suva: Institute of Pacific Studies.

Crossley, M. & Myra M. (1994). Textbook provision and the quality of the school curriculum in developing countries: issues and policy options. **Comparative Education, 30**(2), 99-114.

Fiji Education Commission (1970). **Education for Modern Fiji. Report of the Fiji Education**

Commission of 1969. Suva: Government Printer.
Fiji. Parliament of Fiji (1976). Report of the Senate Select Committe on Education. Parliamentary Paper No. 9 of 1976.
Fiji. Government of Fiji (1993). **Opportunities for Growth, Policies and Strategies for Fiji in the Medium Term.** February 1993.
Gerber, R. (1995). A sociocultural approach to curriculum change. **Curriculum Perspectives 15**(3), 33-41.
Glaser, B.G. (1994). **Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis: Emergence versus Forcing.** Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1971). **Status Passage.** London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
Glaser, B.G. (1978). **Theoretical Sensitivity: Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory.** Mill Valley, CA: The Sociology Press.
Glaser, B.G. & Strauss, A.L. (1967). **The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research.** Chicago: Aldine.
Government of Fiji (1993). **Opportunities for Growth, Policies and Strategies for Fiji in the Medium Term.** February 1993.
Hanushek, E. (1989). The impact of differential expenditures on school performance. **Educational Researcher 18**(4), 45-51.
Hindson, C. (1981). Educational planning in the Pacific. In J. Zajda (Ed.) **Education and Society in the 1980's: A Comparative Analysis** (pp. 160-169). Melbourne: James and Nicholas.
James-Reid, O. & Mitchell, I. (1996). Collaboration for school improvement: Secondary schools in Jamaica. **Caribbean Journal of Education 18**(2), 249-263.
Kazal-Thresher, D. (1993). Educational expenditures and school achievement: When and how money can make a difference. **Educational Researcher 22**(2), 30-32.
Kishor, N. (1981). **Socio-cultural and motivational influences on academic performance - A cross-cultural study of third-form students in Fiji.** Unpublished Masters' thesis, University of the South Pacific, Fiji.
Kishor, N. (1983). Locus of control and academic achievement. Ethnic differences among Fijians. **Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology 14**(3), 297-308.
Lotherington, H. (1998). Language choices and social reality: Education in post-colonial Fiji. **Journal of Intercultural Studies**.
Mangubhai, F. (1984). Fiji. In M.R. Thomas and N.T. Postlethwaite (Eds.) **Schooling in the Pacific Islands. Colonies in Transition** (pp. 167-201). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Postlethwaite, N.T. & Thomas, M.R. (1988). Fiji. In N.T. Postlethwaite (Ed.). **The Encyclopedia of Comparative Education and National Systems of Education.** Oxford: Pergamon Press.
McCracken, J. & Peasley, D. (1995, March). **Rural Ohio school expenditure and student achievement**. Special Circular 147. Ohio State University, Columbus. Dept. of Agricultural Education; Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, Wooster.
Mathews, J. & Johnson, G. (1995). **Per pupil expenditures and school district accreditation: What does the total per pupil expenditure indicator in the 1993 Mississippi Report Card really mean?** Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Biloxi, MS, November 8-10, 1995.
Mugler, F. (1996). 'Vernacular' language teaching in Fiji. In F. Mugler and J. Lynch (Eds.) **Pacific Languages in Education** (pp. 272-287). Suva, Fiji: Institute of Pacific Studies.
Nabobo, U. (1994). Exploring yalomatua: Fijian education and the missing link. **Directions 16**(1), 41-55.
Nabobo, U. & Teasdale, J. (1994). Teacher education for cultural identity in Fiji. **Journal of the**

Fijian Teachers Association, 35-38.
Nabuka, J. (1982). Progress report on project on Fijian education achievement. Fijian Teachers'Association, Suva, Fiji, January 1982.
Nabuka, J. (1984). **Influence of Home Background on the Achievement of Fijian and Indian Studies in Fiji.** Unpublished Master's thesis, Macquarie University, Australia.
Puamau, P.Q. (1991). **Fijian Education - An Examination of Government Policy: 1946-1986.** Unpublished Masters' thesis, University of the South Pacific.
Ravuvu, A. (1987b). **The Fijian ethos.** Suva: University of the South Pacific.
Strauss, A.L. (1987). **Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists.** New York: Cambridge University Press.
Stewart, R. (1984). Cognitive, Socio-cultural and Institutional Explanations for Ethnic Differences in Academic Achievement in Fiji (or Affirmative Action in the South Seas). Paper presented at the Conference on **Thinking**, Cambridge, Mass., August 19-23, 1984.
Stewart R.A. (1983). Fijian education: Its special demands. Keynote address to the opening session of 52nd annual conference of Fiji's principals' association. Suva, Fiji, April 14, 1983.
Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). **Basics of Qualitative Research. Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques.** Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded Theory Methodology. An Overview. In N.K.Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (Eds) **Handbook of Qualitative Research** (pp. 273-285). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
Tavola, H.G. (1990). **Secondary Education in Fiji: An Investigation into School Effectiveness in a Changing Society**. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, London School of Economics and Political Science, University of London.
Tavola, H. (1991). **Secondary Education in Fiji. A Key to the Future.** Suva: University of the South Pacific, Institute of Pacific Studies.
Tierney, M.P. (1971). **A study of factors affecting the academic performance of the rural Fijian student.** Unpublished Master's thesis. University of San Francisco, California.
Tierney, M.P. (1980). **Waicoba: Education and Social Change in Rural Fiji.** Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Berkeley, California.
Toren, C. (1986). **Symbolic Space and the Construction of Hierarchy. An Anthropological and Cognitive Developmental Study in a Fijian Village.** Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London.
UNESCO Report (1983). Jamaica: Development of secondary education. Paris: UNESCO.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE